

Patent
09/493,917**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-18 and 22-26 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 14, 17 and 18 have been amended herein. Claims 22-26 have been added. Claims 1, 10 and 22 are independent.

Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-18 and 20-21 were again rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,537,149 (Teraoka et al.) in view of Applicants admitted prior art (figures 1 and 2). The rejection based on Teraoka and Figures 1 and 2, is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Action acknowledges that Teraoka remains silent on:

- (1) "the display having sensors which detect the image"; and
- (2) "moving the image as a single entire image".

The Action then takes the position that the use of sensors to control the displayed picture is well-known in the art as disclosed by applicant's Fig 1, 2... to ascertain the position of the displayed image and assist in the adjustment of the displayed picture" and that Teraoka discloses "a system which expands or compresses the respective video signal, where the video signal is size adjusted to maintain the distance from the original vertical and horizontal center".

The Action "concludes" that:

"Sensors are conventional in the art, where sensors are used to center a received signal onto a display. In the event a signal is displayed *which has the desired aspect ratio, where the image is shifted down (or up, left or right), in order to center the signal, the signal must be moved (as a single entire image) up (or down, right or left respectively) in order to provide a centered display which maintains the image aspect ratio*".

"Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to *modify Teraoka ... by using conventional sensors as admitted by applicant's Fig 1,2, and moving an image of the desired aspect ratio to the sensors, in order to properly align/display the received signal on the appropriate display*". (emphasis added herein)

Applicants again respectfully submit that Teraoka and Applicants' Figures 1 or 2, taken in any permissible combination, fail to teach or suggest a method for performing autoconvergence in which a received image is moved as an entire image, without increasing any dimensions of the received image, so that each sensor can detect the corresponding side of the image.

Patent
09/493,917

Again, Applicants note that the discussion of Figs 1 and 2 in Applicants' specification specifically states that for sensors 108, 110, 112 and 114, "to perform autoconvergence, the displayed picture *must at least meet or overlap the sensors*" (page 3, lines 10-11). . . . "when a 4:3 aspect picture is displayed on a 16:9 aspect ratio television, the left and right sides of the 4:3 aspect ratio picture *do not meet or overlap the left and right sensors. . . . therefore no patterns can be displayed on the left and right sensors*" (page 3 lines 21-24).

One skilled in the art would *not be motivated* in any way, to modify or combine the teachings of Teraoka, in light of Figs 1 and 2, to implement sensors and to then move an image, as an entire image, towards each sensor, when Teraoka only describes "stretching/compressing an image non-linearly to maintain the center portion of the original signal" (page 8 of Action).

Each of independent Claims 1 and 10 has been further amended¹ to clarify the scope and meaning of "moving said image as an entire image without increasing any of the dimensions of said image, so that each sensor can detect said corresponding side of said image". Support for this language may be found at least at page 10, lines 1-4 of Applicants' specification as filed.

In addition, in response to the Examiner's assertion (first full paragraph on page 4 of Action), that "in the event a signal is displayed which has the desired aspect ratio, where the image is shifted down (or up, left or right), in order to center the signal, the signal must be moved (as a single entire image) up (or down, right or left respectively) in order to provide a centered display which maintains the image aspect ratio", Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion finds no support in either Teraoka or Figs 1-2. Accordingly, if the Examiner maintains this position, *actual support for the statement must be provided*.

In addition, Applicants strongly assert that what the Examiner alleges would be an "obvious" modification/combo to "one of ordinary skill the art", is actually *taught away from* by the teachings of Teraoka – specifically, Teraoka describes "stretching/compressing an image non-linearly to maintain the center portion of the original signal" – this is *completely opposite*, and in fact *teaches away from*, Applicants' recitation of "moving an image without increasing any of its dimensions", so that each sensor can detect a corresponding side of the image.

¹ Dependent Claims 5, 8, 9, 14, 17 and 18 have also been amended herein to further clarify the scope of those claims.

Patent
09/493,917

Finally, Applicants again submit that even if Teraoka discloses "stretching an image" -it fails to teach or suggest moving an image by shifting the entire image, without increasing any of its dimensions, towards the sensor, so that each sensor can detect the corresponding side of the image.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 10, as amended herein, are patentable over any permissible combination of the teachings of Teraoka and Figs 1 and 2, there is no prima facie case of obviousness, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Newly-submitted independent Claim 22 also includes the limitation of "moving said image as a single entire image, without increasing any of the dimensions of said image" (...so that each of the at least two sensors can detect said corresponding side of said image), and is therefore believed patentable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with regard to independent Claims 1 and 10.

If the Examiner should maintain his rejections after careful consideration of this response, request is respectfully made for an interview to clarify any outstanding issues. In this respect, request is made that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney at (908) 518-7700 in order that any outstanding issues be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,



Karin L. Williams

Registration No. 36,721

Please Continue to Send All Future Correspondence to:

Mayer, Fortkort & Williams LLC
251 North Avenue West, 2nd Floor
Westfield NJ 07090